

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

ROOFER’S PENSION FUND, Individually
and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiffs,

-vs-

PAPA, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 16-CV-2805-MCA-LDW

**[PROPOSED] ORDER
GRANTING PERRIGO’S
MOTION TO SEAL
PORTIONS OF
LETTERS DATED
FEBRUARY 26, 2020**

This matter having come before the Court by counsel for defendant Perrigo Company plc (“Perrigo”), seeking an order granting the motion to permanently seal limited portions of certain letters dated February 26, 2020; the specific material for which sealing is requested having been identified in the index annexed as Exhibit 1 to the Notice of Motion to Seal Portions of Letters Dated February 26, 2020; this Court having fully considered the briefing provided by Perrigo and the Declaration of R. David Gallo filed in support of Perrigo’s Motion; and the Court having found that the standards of Local Civil Rule 5.3(c)(3) have been met and support the sealing, and for good cause shown:

IT IS on this _____ day of _____, 2020;

ORDERED that Perrigo’s Motion to Seal Portions of Letters Dated February 26, 2020 is Granted and the parties shall file on the public docket of the above-captioned action, and on the public docket of any related action in which the same papers were filed, a redacted version of the papers identified in Exhibit 1 annexed to the Notice of Motion containing only those redactions as identified in Exhibit 1;

The following Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are made in support of this Order:

1. Letters filed on February 26, 2020 in advance of a March 2, 2020 teleconference with the Court reference: (a) confidential proceedings in another forum which relate to confidential business information of Perrigo, (b) discovery materials, and (c) ongoing government investigations.

2. The public interest is not served by exposing confidential business information, *United Therapeutics Corp. v. Actavis Labs FL, Inc.*, 2017 WL 2172438, *2-3 (D.N.J. May 17, 2017), non-public discovery materials, *N. Jersey Media Grp., Inc. v. United States*, 836 F.3d 421, 434-35 (3d Cir. 2016), or sensitive information concerning an ongoing government investigation, *United States v. Hirsh*, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 45485, at *8-9 (E.D. Pa. June 22, 2007).

3. The redactions are minimal and obscure only such limited information as is necessary to avoid exposure of confidential and sensitive information.

4. There is no reasonable less restrictive alternative to the redactions Ordered.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: _____

Leda Dunn Wettre
U.S. Magistrate Judge